THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL OF LABOR

HD6495
.U4W27

LUTHER HESS WARING

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 2 1948
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HD6495
.U4W27

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL OF LABOR

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 2 1948
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL OF LABOR

BY

LUTHER HESS WARING, M. A.

Author of SUNDAYS IN LONDON
Editor of STONES ROLLED AWAY (Henry Drummond)

NEW YORK AND WASHINGTON
THE NEALE PUBLISHING COMPANY
1907

Copyright, 1907, by
LUTHER HESS WARING.

"Labor, wide as the earth, has its summit
in Heaven."

—*Carlyle.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION,	11
PART I.—THE LABOR UNION AND THE LAW.	
The Labor Union and the Law,	17
The Law as to Strikes,	21
The Law as to Boycotts,	49
The Law as to Injunctions,	61
The Labor Union and the Militia,	71
The Labor Union and Incorporation,	87
PART II.—THE GOSPEL OF LABOR.	
Labor and Christianity,	95
The Psalm of Love,	139

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL OF LABOR

INTRODUCTION

The reports of the U. S. Commissioner of Labor show that, in the last twenty years of the past century, this country had 22,793 labor strikes, involving estimated losses of $257,-863,478 to the employes, and $122,731,121 to the employers. The total number of strikers was 4,694,849.

The latest official reports for Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands show that these seven European countries are making a record of from 4,000 to 5,000 strikes per annum, of which hardly more than one-fourth are successful, and about two-fifths are absolute failures; and that a total of from 12,000,000 to 15,000,-000 days' labor is lost thereby each year.

In industrial matters, as in others, personal knowledge and experience cannot be discounted. What one sees he must believe. To what one knows he can testify.

During my three and a half years' residence in one of the busy manufacturing cities of

our country, scores of strikes, with their attendant lawlessness and violence, took their turn in quick succession. Some strike was in progress every day. At various times and for varying periods, there were strikes of several thousand silk mill girls, three thousand machinists and allied trades, seven hundred railroad shopmen, and hundreds of carpenters. From three to four hundred street car employes were on strike twice,—once for one week, and once for six months. Nearly 150,000 mine workers in the surrounding districts went on strike twice. They remained out in the one case six weeks, and in the other six months. Besides these, there were no less than a hundred or more local strikes at various collieries, involving one hundred, five hundred, or a thousand employes in each. Then there were strikes of mine firemen, of painters, tailors, bootblacks, newsboys, teamsters, switchmen, etc. It was conservatively estimated that one year's strikes in that one city alone cost, on an average, $100 apiece for every head of a family.

When I appealed to the children in my own community and in front of my own residence, during a strike, not to place obstructions on

the street car tracks, load the trolley wires overhead, stone the cars and crews, and yell opprobrious names, they said: "Why, don't you know there's a strike?" It is in this manner that the rising generation in such communities is imbibing the spirit of lawlessness and anarchy and the idea that the labor union is a body and the striker and his sympathizers are individuals entirely without and beyond the reach and the intent of the law of the land, and subject to a different moral code; and that the destruction of property, assaulting of non-union labor and interference with the constitutional rights of others at such a time is all right. When the child yells "scab" and "blackleg," and hurls clubs and stones at others; when the boy places rails, planks and dynamite on tracks; when men hang and burn and bury in effigy; when they congregate by the dozens, or by the hundreds and thousands, with the determined purpose that no man shall pass their lines to get to his work during their strike,—come what may; when they viciously assault and beat, and sometimes kill, others; when they set fire to others' homes or to their employers' property; when they throw a rope around a man's neck to hang him, simply

because he wants to work; when they dynamite and stone his home; when they hold up street cars and try to derail railroad trains, to seek non-union workers and prevent them from going to work; when they systematically invoke the terrible boycott, which is not only a crime, generally speaking, under the laws of our country, but a sin in the sight of heaven; when all these things are being done, as they are, not only in one community, but in various sections of the entire country again and again; then, I maintain, it is high time for every manly man of every class and creed, for every honorable and honest man, for every loyal patriot, and for every follower of the gospel of Jesus Christ to face his duty.

I have lived, in the time of the strike and the boycott, where all these conditions existed. I have seen a man assert his right to work, when a union wanted a strike, and seen how unpleasant his life and how unsafe his person has been thereafter; and yet our Constitution guarantees "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." I have seen other children refuse to go to the public schools with children of the non-union workman because the latter continued to work. I have seen endeavors made

to put non-union workmen out of orders and even out of churches. I have seen storekeepers notified by the union's committees not to sell to them or their families—if they are not in sympathy with a current strike—any goods or provisions. I have seen their families ostracized in the community. Constable and justice have been in the mobs that committed violence. In at least one instance, all the policemen of a borough resigned and refused to serve under a "scab" chief of police. I have seen animosities and open hostilities such as these that will never die out in this generation; and it has been a veritable hell on earth.

It is the aim of this book to present, for consideration in connection with this phase of the labor question, first, the law of the land, and, secondly, the highest law known to man,—the gospel of Jesus Christ.

PART I

THE LABOR UNION AND THE LAW

Two facts stand out so prominently that they need only the bare assertion to be generally recognized as sound and true. The one is that every manly man, every patriotic citizen, will be law-abiding; and the other is that there can be no class legislation in this country.

The frequency with which strikes follow one another nowadays, the lawlessness and violence that attend them in almost every instance, and the singular attitude of the labor unions towards the government are matters of the greatest concern to every lover of law and order, to every peaceable citizen, to every taxpayer, and indeed to every individual. I am full well aware of the constant statement on the part of union agitators and leaders that they are not responsible for the mobs and the violence, and that they ask their membership to abstain from every form of lawlessness—so far as the "overt act" is concerned; but

when that membership has been taught and trained to deny to other workmen—even in times of industrial peace—the rights and privileges guaranteed by our Constitution and by our laws, it cannot be expected that they will do better when their blood is stirred by a strike. They seek to deprive the non-unionist of his means of livelihood. As a union, they deliberately order the boycott, which is contrary to law and morals alike; and it is not at all surprising that their emissaries should engage in other forms of lawlessness under such instruction and under such training.

I have never known of a labor union disciplining a member for lawlessness during a strike,—no expulsion, no suspension, not even formal censure of the member who has been convicted in a court of justice. Quite on the contrary, the unionists defend such a member at the bar; they seek by every means to secure an acquittal; they often, if not usually, pay the fine, where one is imposed; they apply for a pardon, if one of their number is sentenced to confinement; they oppose any law that will hold them accountable for their acts, or in any way restrain them; they invariably condemn the calling out of the militia in case of a strike

riot; they are opposed, as a rule, to incorporation for the labor organization; and they are uniformly opposed to any "compulsory arbitration" scheme.

One thing is very clear. A labor union mob, in the sight of the law, has no more rights than any other mob, and may and should be held to strict accountability. The rights and liberties of the American people, as pledged by the Constitution and the laws of these United States and each separate State, will be maintained. There is no doubt about that. The American people, as a whole, are longsuffering and endure a great deal, by way of sufferance; but there is a point beyond which it will not be wise for any body of men to go in the persistent denial of these constitutional rights, or in the way of systematic and oft-repeated riots, with almost every form of lawlessness. The penalty may be deferred for a time, but the delay will only add to its severity. Unfortunately, there has been entirely too much laxity in the enforcement of law in such matters. Sympathy, sentiment, terror or fear on the part of magistrates, police, witnesses, courts, juries and the press are often responsible for the escape of ninety-nine out of every hun-

dred law-breakers in the labor riot. The labor union, especially in time of strike, manifests a singular disregard, if not contempt, for the law. I am not referring here to what it publicly declares on the subject, but to what it actually does, through its individual officers and members, and, indirectly, by their influence, through its sympathizers and affiliated unions.

As for the boycott, it does not have any foundation in liberty, equality, or fraternity. A unionist said to me, in speaking of a union that had published a boycott, that its members ought to have known better, that they should have announced the boycott only in the meetings of the different local unions. This would be the attitude of a man imagining he had not committed a crime, if the public did not discover that he was a criminal. The crime consists, not in the fact that it has been discovered, but that it has been committed. The union that establishes a boycott is lawless, because such an act is contrary to law and prohibited by it. The question as to whether the general public has information about it does not affect the case. A conspiracy concealed is a conspiracy still.

THE LAW AS TO STRIKES.

The term "strike" was given a judicial definition in the case of the D. L. & W. R. R. Co. *vs.* Bowns[1]. "A strike," the court said, "is a combination among laborers, those employed by others, to compel an increase of wages, a change in the hours of labor, some change in the mode and manner of conducting the business of the principal, or to enforce some particular policy in the character or number of the men employed, or the like."

Mr. Carson, in the appendix to Wright on Criminal Conspiracies,[2] says: "The result of all cases, ignoring matters of detail or special circumstances, appears to be as follows: Workmen may combine lawfully for their own protection and common benefit; for the advancement of their own interests, for the development of skill in their trade, or to prevent overcrowding therein, or to encourage those belonging to their trade to enter their guild;

[1]58 N. Y., 582.
[2]American Edition, 1887.

for the purpose of raising their wages, or to secure a benefit which they can claim by law. The moment, however, that they proceed by threats, intimidation, violence, obstruction, or molestation, in order to secure their ends; or where their object be to impoverish third persons, or to extort money from their employers, or to ruin their business, or to encourage strikes or breaches of contract among others, or to restrict the freedom of others for the purpose of compelling employers to conform to their views, or to attempt to enforce rules upon those not members of their association, they render themselves liable to indictment."

The rights of employer and employed under the common law are these:[3] "Every one has the right to work or refuse to work for whom and on what terms he pleases, or to refuse to deal with whom he pleases; and a number of persons, if they have no unlawful object in view, have the right to agree that they will not work under a fixed price or without certain conditions. The right of employes to refuse to work, either singly or in combination, except upon terms and conditions satisfactory to themselves, is balanced by the right of em-

[3]U. S. Department of Labor Bulletin No. 1, pp. 98, 99.

ployers to refuse to engage the services of any one for any reason they deem proper. The master may fix the wages, and other conditions not unlawful, upon which he will employ workmen, and has the right to refuse to employ them upon any other terms. In short, both employers and employes are entitled to exercise the fullest liberty in entering into contracts of service, and neither party can hold the other responsible for refusing to enter into such contracts. It has been held, however, that employers in separate, independent establishments have no right to combine for the purpose of preventing workmen who have incurred the hostility of one of them from securing employment upon any terms and by the method commonly known as blacklisting, debarring such workmen from exercising their vocation, such a combination being regarded as a criminal conspiracy. On the other hand, a combination of employes having for its purpose the accomplishment of an illegal object is unlawful; for instance, a conspiracy to extort money from an employer by inducing his workmen to leave him and deterring others from entering his service is illegal; and an association which undertakes to coerce work-

men to become members thereof or to dictate to employers as to the methods or terms upon which their business shall be conducted by means of force, threats or intimidation, interfering with their traffic or lawful employment of other persons is, as to such purposes, an illegal combination. Unlawful interference by employes, or former employes, or persons acting in sympathy with them, with the business of a railroad company in the hands of a receiver renders the persons interfering liable to punishment for contempt of court."

The constitutions of the various States, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, are supreme within their respective jurisdictions. Therefore the constitution of the State of Pennsylvania,—to cite a single illustration,—under the Constitution of the United States and the laws enacted in pursuance thereof, is the supreme law of that Commonwealth. In Article I of its Declaration of Rights, we read: "That the general, great, and essential principles of liberty and free government may be recognized and unalterably established, we declare: That all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and indefeasible rights, among which

are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness."

Section II of Article I of the same constitution further provides: "All courts shall be open; and every man, for an injury done him in lands, goods, person, or reputation, shall have remedy by due course of law, and right and justice administered without sale, denial, or delay."

These rights and privileges are guaranteed by the State to every individual, whether it be a time of industrial war or peace; and, at any time that they are withheld or denied—except by due process of law—the entire power of the Commonwealth is obligated to restore and support them, whether it mean men or money, whether it mean ballot or bullet. Every citizen of the Commonwealth owes allegiance and loyalty to its laws; and the Commonwealth, on the other hand, owes protection to every citizen.

When the power of the State is unable, or, for any reason, fails to maintain these rights that are pledged to every citizen, then the United States is obligated with all its force to

step in and secure them. Article XIV of the Constitution of the United States provides: "Nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Section 5299, Revised Statutes of the United States, which became a law April 20, 1871, provides: "Whenever insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combinations, or conspiracies in any State so obstructs or hinders the execution of the laws thereof, and of the United States, as to deprive any portion or class of the people of such State of any of the rights, privileges, or immunities, or protection, named in the Constitution and secured by the laws for the protection of such rights, privileges, or immunities, and the constituted authorities of such State are unable to protect, or, from any cause, fail in or refuse protection of the people in such rights, such facts shall be deemed a denial by such State of the equal protection of the laws to which they are entitled under the Constitution of the United States; and in all such cases, or whenever any such insurrection, violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, opposes or obstructs the

laws of the United States, or the due execution thereof, or impedes or obstructs the due course of justice under the same, it shall be lawful for the President, and it shall be his duty, to take such measures, by the employment of the militia or the land and naval forces of the United States, or of either, or by other means, as he may deem necessary, for the suppression of such insurrection, domestic violence, or combinations."

Section 3995, Revised Statutes of the United States, penalizes the knowing and wilful obstruction of the transit of mails; the several interstate commerce laws make it a misdemeanor to interfere with interstate transportation; and the anti-trust law of 1890 declares illegal every combination in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations. The Supreme Court of the United States has interpreted this to apply alike to combinations of labor as well as to combinations of capital.

Much legislation has been passed from year to year in the different States as to the limits to which labor unions may go and yet remain within the law. For example, the last general act of the Pennsylvania Legislature on this

subject is the act of June 16, 1891.[4] It is as follows: "It shall be lawful for employes acting either as individuals or collectively, or as the members of any club, assembly, association or organization, to refuse to work or labor for any person, persons, corporation or corporations, whenever in his, her or their opinion the wages paid are insufficient, or his, her or their treatment is offensive or unjust, or whenever the continued labor or work by him, her or them would be contrary to the constitution, rules, regulations, by-laws, resolution or resolutions, of any club, assembly, association, organization or meeting of which he, she or they may be a member or may have attended, and as such individuals or members or as having attended any meeting, it shall be lawful for him, her or them to devise and adopt ways and means to make such rules, regulations, by-laws, resolution or resolutions effective, without subjecting them to indictment for conspiracy at common law or under the criminal laws of this commonwealth: Provided, First: That this act shall not be held to apply to the member or members of any club, assembly, association,

[4] P. L. 300.

organization or meeting, the constitution, rules, regulations, by-laws, resolution or resolutions of which are not in conformity with the Constitution of the United States and to the constitution of this Commonwealth; Provided, Second: That nothing herein contained shall prevent the prosecution and punishment, under any law, other than that of conspiracy, of any person or persons who shall, by the use of force, threats or menace of harm to person or property, hinder or attempt to hinder any person or persons who may desire to labor or work for any employer from so doing for such wages and upon such terms and conditions as he, she or they may deem proper. And Provided, Third: That nothing herein contained shall prevent the prosecutions and punishment of any persons conspiring to commit a felony."

This act freed strikers from indictment for conspiracy for merely refusing to work, but provided that it should not prevent the prosecution and punishment, under any law other than conspiracy, of persons who should, by the use of force, threat or menace of harm to person or property, hinder or attempt to hinder any person or persons who may desire to work

or labor for any employer from so doing for such wages and upon such terms and conditions as he, she or they may deem proper. It is also to be noted that this act specifically applies only to those organizations or associations whose by-laws, rules, regulations and resolutions are not contrary to the Constitution of the United States or the constitution of the State. No striker is in any way freed from responsibility for any act he commits, alone or with others—the same as any other individual in the State—except that under this law he cannot be indicted for "conspiracy" for the simple refusal to continue work.

The general principle here enunciated is recognized over the whole country. The constitution of one of our newer States, North Dakota, specifically and clearly lays down this right of every man: "Every citizen of this State shall be free to obtain employment wherever possible, and every person maliciously interfering or hindering in any way any citizen from obtaining or enjoying employment from any other person, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor." Some fifteen States have modified the old common law of conspiracy by statute, granting to laborers a right to com-

bine to secure increased wages or to peaceably induce others to accept or quit any given employment. New Jersey, Texas and Colorado, by statute, permit combinations for the purpose of peaceably inducing others to strike or quit work. Maryland and California have statutes declaring that no combination to do any act in furtherance of a trade dispute shall be indictable as a conspiracy, if such act committed by one person would not be punishable as an offense.

A great number of cases have been passed upon by our different courts, convicting and punishing for annoyance, threats, disorderly conduct, assaults, etc.; but it is not necessary to cite many. It has been declared again and again that a man has no legal right to follow another man around on the street, or to or from his work, or harass him in any way. He not only has no right to call him vile names, but he has no right to impose his arguments and "persuasion" upon him in any way, against the latter's will. In other words, a man has no right to follow me on the street or to my work and continue annoying me with his pleadings and views—even where there is no threatening language or opprobrious epithet

used. It is not only unpleasant and unmanly, but it is unlawful. When the individual "persuader" becomes a crowd or a mob, the "persuasion" becomes coercion.

Justice Mitchell, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in the case of O'Neil *vs.* Behanna,[5] in 1897, said: "The testimony establishes the fact that certain of the defendants overstepped these bounds and used annoyance, intimidation, ridicule and coercion to prevent new men from engaging in work for the plaintiff. When the new men were followed and importuned not to work, from their point of embarkation to their destination, and there met by the strikers in considerable numbers, and followed to their lodging places, all the time being pressed and entreated to return, and called 'scabs' and 'blacklegs,' and sometimes surrounded and an effort made to pull them away, an unfriendly (at least) atmosphere about everywhere, it must be admitted that there was something more than mere argument and persuasion, and the orderly and legitimate conduct of a strike. This was certainly serious annoyance and well calculated to intimidate and coerce. And that effect was

[5]182 Penna., 236.

apparently produced on more than one occasion. Nor did such acts entirely end when the men imported actually began work, but such men were, on occasions and in a less public manner, approached in a like manner in their intervals of labor, and advised that there would be trouble there, and they had better leave. No actual violence, however, was employed.

"This is a mild and judicially restrained statement of what the evidence clearly showed. The strikers and their counsel seem to think that the former could do anything to attain their ends, short of actual physical violence. This is a most serious misconception. The 'arguments' and 'persuasion' and 'appeals' of a hostile and demonstrative mob have a potency over men of ordinary nerve which far exceeds the limits of lawfulness. The display of force, though none is actually used, is intimidation, and as much unlawful as violence itself."

In Peop. *vs.* Wilzig,[6] it was said: "The men who walk up and down in front of a man's shop may be guilty of intimidation, though they never raise a finger or utter a word. Their attitude may, nevertheless, be that of

[6] 4 N. Y. Crim. Rep., 403 (1886).

menace. They may intimidate by their numbers, their methods, their placards, their circulars and their devices."

Vice Chancellor Pitney, in hearing charges that twenty-three striking silk mill employes were in contempt of court for having violated an injunction restraining them from interfering with non-union people, at Paterson, N. J., delivered this opinion during the proceedings (June, 1901): "One person has no right to speak to another against his will or make it disagreeable for another to work. A person has the same rights in the streets as he has in his own home. The rule of law is that an act must be construed as not to interfere with private rights. The right to influence a man by just argument and persuasion must not be done without the man's consent. You have no more right to accost him on the street against his will than to invade his home for that purpose. These girls are not to be accosted on the street nor to have faces made at them nor to be pointed out to others and annoyed."

Judge Wing, of the Northern District of Ohio, in a suit to restrain picketing by an iron

molders' union,[7] said: "Whether this picketing has been accompanied by violence or not we need not consider. . . . This system, constantly kept up, in its nature leads to disturbance, and has a tendency to intimidate. That it is used by the defendants as a means of enforcing their unauthorized mandate, and that it accompanies the utterance of it, is an admission by the defendants that it will prove effective in enforcing such mandate. It is therefore a violation of the rights of this complainant, and of all non-union men, or of any and all men who choose to work in disobedience to the orders of this defendant union. . . . It is unlawful for any man to dictate to another what his conduct shall be, and to attempt to enforce such dictation by any form of undue pressure. Nor must intimidation be disguised in the assumed character of persuasion. Persuasion, too emphatic or too long and persistently continued, may itself become a nuisance, and its use a form of unlawful coercion."

A manly man will not do to others what he would not like them to do to him. A good

[7]Otis Steel Co., Ltd., *vs.* Local Union No. 218, of Cleveland, Ohio, of Iron Molders' Union of North America *et al.,* 110 Fed. Rep., 698.

citizen will not do anything that is contrary to law, whatever his personal sentiments may be in the matter. That is to say, the man who evades and breaks the law is not a good citizen. Any body of men, in like manner, whether a labor union or any other organization, that deliberately plans to restrain other people's rights and privileges, and that systematically engages in coercion is not a patriotic one, but one that stands as a menace to good government.

The laborer of this country is protected in many ways beyond all others. A well-known writer has called attention to this fact in the following language:[8] "No other American citizen has his contracts regulated by the State, his times of payment fixed, his liberty to break them secured by law, his property freed from judgment, while upon the property of his debtors he is given a prior lien. In no other occupation than that of personal labor is a man left free to perform his own contracts or not, while the other side is held to them."

Judge McPherson, of the United States Circuit Court for the District of Nebraska, de-

[8]Labor in its Relations to Law, F. J. Stimson, 1895.

clared in a case,[9] the defendants in which were members of a union which had undertaken to compel the Union Pacific Railway Company "to come to the International Union" to procure machinists to do its work in its shops at Omaha:

"(1) The defendants acted within their right when they went out on a strike. Whether with good cause, or without any cause or reason, they had the right to quit work for the Union Pacific Railroad Company, and their reasons for quitting work were reasons they need not give to any one. And that they all went out in a body, by agreement or preconcerted arrangement, does not militate against them or affect this case in any way.

"(2) Such rights are reciprocal, and the company had the right to discharge any or all of the defendants, with or without cause, and it cannot be inquired into as to what the cause was.

"(3) It is immaterial whether the defendants are not now in the service of the company because of a strike or a lockout.

"(4) The defendants have the right to combine and work together in whatsoever way they believe will increase their earnings, shorten their hours, lessen their labor, or better their condition,

[9] Union Pacific Railway Co. *vs.* Ruef, 120 Fed. Rep., 102.

and it is for them, and they (them) only, to say whether they will work by the day or by piece work. All such is part of their liberty. And they can so conclude as individuals, or as organizations, or as unions.

"(5) And the right is also reciprocal. The railroad company has the right to have its work done by the premium or piece system, without molestation or interference by defendants or others. This is liberty for the company, and the company alone has the right to determine as to that matter.

"(6) When the defendants went on a strike, or when put out on a lockout, their relations with the company were at an end; they were no longer employes of the company; and the places they once occupied in the shops were no longer their places, and never can be again, excepting by mutual agreement between the defendants and the company.

"(7) No one of the defendants can be compelled by any law, or by any order of any court, to again work for the company on any terms or under any conditions.

"(8) The company cannot be compelled to employ again any of defendants, or any other person, by any law, or by any order of any court, on any terms, or under any conditions.

"(9) Each, all, and every of the foregoing matters between the company and the defendants are precisely the same, whether applied to the company or to the defendants.

"(10) The company has the right to employ others to take the places once filled by defendants; and in employing others the defendants are not to be consulted, and it is of no lawful concern to them, and they can make no lawful complaint by reason thereof. And it makes no difference whether such new employes are citizens of Omaha or of some other city or State. A citizen of Chicago, or from any State in the Union, has the same rights as to work in Omaha as has a citizen of Omaha.

"(11) Defendants have the right to argue or discuss with the new employes the question whether the new employes should work for the company. They have the right to persuade them if they can. But in presenting the matter they have no right to use force or violence. They have no right to terrorize or intimidate the new employes. The new employes have the right to come and go as they please, without fear or molestation, and without being compelled to discuss this or any other question, and without being guarded or picketed; and persistent and continued and objectionable persuasion by numbers is of itself intimidating, and not allowable.

"(12) Picketing in proximity to the shops or elsewhere on the streets of the city, if in fact it annoys or intimidates the new employes, is not allowable. . . . In short, the rights of all parties are one and the same."

The sympathetic strike has been held illegal. It is not a combination of individuals to raise their own wages or secure for themselves better hours or conditions of labor, nor is it dictation as to employment and discharge, but a combination to secure one or more of these things for other men, who may be of an entirely different trade than themselves. This is, therefore, a conspiracy in the eyes of the law. Mr. Justice Brewer, of the Supreme Court of the United States, in delivering the opinion of the Court in a case where this point was involved,[10] said: "We yield to none in our admiration of any act of heroism or self-sacrifice, but we may be permitted to add that it is a lesson which cannot be learned too soon or too thoroughly that under this government of and by the people the means of redress of all wrongs are through the courts and at the ballot box, and that no wrong, real or fancied,

[10]In re Debs, 158 U. S. Reports, 598, 599 (1894).

carries with it legal warrant to invite as a means of redress the co-operation of a mob, with its accompanying acts of violence."

The sympathetic strike is not only illegal, but it is dishonorable and senseless. For men who are perfectly satisfied with their employment in every particular to go out on strike and injure their employer because some other employer in the same or another trade is not treating his employes according to the union demands is not only unfair, but it is unnatural as well. I can have no confidence in men who leave satisfactory service in such a way. The employer who treats his men considerately and liberally is treated by the sympathetic strike in the same way as the meanest employer. A contractor of my acquaintance was putting up a building several years ago, under a penalty of $50 a day if not completed by a certain time. Among the men at work was one tinner. The employer went to the building one day only to find that the men had all quit work. He asked what it meant. They said they did not know why it was, but they had orders to quit work. He investigated, and found that this one tinner who was working on the building had failed to pay his dues to the union to

which he belonged; and, because he owed his dues to his union, all the other union men in other trades were called off from work.

In the same city, during a street car strike, a number of other unions formally passed resolutions expressing sympathy with the street car strikers and forbidding, under penalty of a fixed fine, any of their members from riding on the cars. All these unions were responsible and indictable for conspiracy. There would be difficulty in getting the necessary evidence as to who were present at the meetings of the unions when such resolutions were passed and who voted for them; but the laws of that State hold such individuals and such unions and every member responsible and indictable for conspiracy.

The person who yells "scab," "blackleg," "louse" and other filthy epithets can be arrested for disorderly conduct, fined and sent to jail. More than that, he can be put under bonds to keep the peace. A Pennsylvania judge put such parties under $1,000 bonds. Still further, civil action can be brought in equity to have a bill of damages assessed against a union that conspires to injure or destroy one's business or property, or infringe

upon the rights of any other citizen; and every member of such a union is responsible, to his last dollar. All persons uniting, combining or agreeing to such an unlawful combination or conspiracy are equally guilty with the original conspirators themselves. The overt act of one member of such a combination becomes the act of all, and for such act all are equally criminally and civilly responsible. Patriotic and manly men will not combine to break the law. Where the officers of the law in a community faithfully perform their duties, where business men against whom conspiracies are aimed and other individuals demand the rigid enforcement of the law, law-breaking has a limit.

At a time of strike disturbance, some communities, — cowardly, helpless, or terror-stricken,—do nothing. The mob is made up, for the most part, of men without property, who have nothing to risk, who care for nothing and consider nothing except the accomplishment of their personal ends at any cost, if they can only escape detection and punishment. Every county or every community should stand the expense, as well as the odium, of its own lawlessness or the lawlessness it

permits. Let the cost of police, deputy sheriffs, State constabulary, and the military necessary in case of riot and lawlessness be placed where it belongs. In default of payment, let there be imprisonment. Such a law would have a marked effect in helping every citizen to do his duty to the State in taking whatever steps may be necessary at any time to immediately suppress lawless uprisings of any kind. We need a return to the loyalty and patriotism of the earlier years of this country's history.

People who know about crime and criminals and who conceal the facts are not good citizens. The safety and the rights of a people depend upon the safety and the rights of all, and those of all depend upon those of each one. Unless each citizen measures up to the mark, the commonwealth suffers. For the same reason that the law holds every member of a mob as guilty, so every citizen is disloyal in not taking steps to have lawlessness, of which he is personally cognizant, punished. There can be no neutrality in time of riot. Every man is a rioter, or conniving at it, on the one hand, or is taking measures to suppress it, on the other hand. There can be no "peaceful onlookers."

I believe that it would be well to have a law that, upon conviction of the graver crimes —certainly after several convictions—a man should be disfranchised for at least a term of years and not be permitted to hold any public office; for a lawless man is certainly not a safe man to guide or guard the interests of the State. He is not a safe man to be trusted on the witness stand or on the jury; and he should be declared incompetent for either place. I refer here to the rioter, the would-be-assassin, the dynamiter, the conspirator in crimes resulting from the strike and the boycott, as well as the election officer who stuffs the ballot box, the perjured witness, the briber and the bribed, of all classes and creeds alike.

Patriotism and obedience to the law should be taught and instilled into the minds of the children of the public schools. Other countries set an example here that we may well follow.

I would urge a law providing that any men who assault or attack another man while he is in the peaceful pursuit of his work or pleasure and is not disturbing any one else, simply because such man refuses to perform their bidding, shall be given a preliminary hearing at once, and, if the evidence is sufficient, be re-

manded to jail, without bail, to await jury trial. The man who commits an assault or participates in a riot once during a strike is very likely to do it a second time, even where he has been arrested for the first offense, if as yet unpunished and at large under bail. Experience has shown that such men are a constant menace at such time to the public peace.

No man is to be denied the right to learn any trade he chooses; nor is any man to be denied the right to work as many hours and as strenuously as he pleases,—except where the safety and the lives of others are thus endangered; and then the limitation must come from the regularly constituted powers of the State, and not from any self-appointed, self-constituted body. No man is to be denied the right to work by compulsion, intimidation, threat, boycott or insult. No man is to be denied his right to employ or discharge a workman,—whether belonging to any or no union, organization, church, class, race, or creed. It matters not what his reason is, or whether he has any at all; for, regardless of what my reason may be for not wanting to

work for any particular individual or corporation, I cannot be compelled to do so.

Industrial lawlessness must cease. The public has rights, and the public has authority. That authority and that power will stay the hands of the lawless. I am a warm friend to labor of all kinds; for I abhor the lazy man. I am a friend to labor organizations for the uplifting of their membership through peaceful, honorable and helpful measures; but I am opposed to strikes as ever conducive to lawlessness and as contrary in principle to manhood and good morals; and I am yet more opposed to the boycott as contrary alike to the law of the land and the higher law of divine right.

I believe, to go a step farther, that no man has a moral right to wilfully continue idle. He owes it to himself, his family, his country and posterity to be actually at work or fitting himself for better work, so that his fellowmen may be the better for his having lived. The mere fact that a man "does not have to work" to make his living does not relieve him from this moral obligation to be industrious and add something to the sum of human happiness.

THE LAW AS TO BOYCOTTS

The boycott is an organized effort to exclude a person or persons from business relations with others by persuasion, intimidation, and other acts which tend to violence and thereby coerce him through fear of resulting injury to submit to dictation in the management of his affairs. The naked boycott, aiming to injure some definite person or class of persons or the destruction of certain property has never been and is not legal to-day. A combination to injure or control the liberty of an individual is always illegal in the United States, and sometimes criminal.

Mr. Stimson briefly sums up the law of conspiracy thus:[11] "A criminal conspiracy, or a conspiracy which subjects the partaker either to criminal punishment or to damages to the person injured is either:

"1. A combination to do an illegal or immoral thing, or to injure a definite person or class of persons, or the public generally,

[11]Labor in its Relations to Law, F. J. Stimson.

whether the means employed be legal or not, and although the thing sought or the act done would not, in the case of a single person, subject him to any liability. Or:

"2. It is a combination to do a perfectly legal thing by means which are, or any one of which is, criminal or illegal; and in both cases the thing punished is the *combination* to do to others as you would not have them do to you, and not any single act; nor indeed, does it need any act whatever to make the combining persons liable in damages or even subject to the criminal law."

The two points to be noted are: (1) it is enough if the object be immoral or wrong—it need not be illegal; (2) that the intention is made criminal even without the act.

A legal definition was given to the term boycott by Judge Wm. H. Taft, Circuit Court, N. D. Ohio, in a case before him:[12] "As usually understood, a boycott is a combination of many to cause a loss to one person by coercing others, against their will, to withdraw from him their beneficial business intercourse, through threats that, unless those others do so, the many will

[12]Toledo, etc., Ry. Co. *vs.* Penn. Co., 54 Fed. Rep., 730, 738 (1893).

cause similar loss to them. Ordinarily, when such a combination of persons does not use violence, actual or threatened, to accomplish their purpose, it is difficult to point out with clearness the illegal means or end which makes the combination an unlawful conspiracy; for it is generally lawful for the combiners to withdraw their intercourse and its benefits from any person, and to announce their intention of doing so, and it is equally lawful for the others, of their own motion, to do that which the combiners seek to compel them to do. Such combinations are said to be unlawful conspiracies, though the acts in themselves and considered singly are innocent, when the acts are done with malice, *i. e.* with the intention to injure another without lawful excuse."

In discussing this subject, Judge Taft said again: "Boycotts, though unaccompanied by violence or intimidation, have been pronounced unlawful in every State of the United States where the question has arisen, unless it be in Minnesota."

In a paper before the American Bar Association, Mr. Charles Claflin Allen used language concerning the boycott that is none too strong when he said: "As frequently applied,

it is one of the most heartless and brutal manifestations of private revenge recorded in history, and is calculated to call forth the abhorrence and just reprehension of all men who respect law and love liberty. There may be an ideal boycott, as there is said to be an ideal anarchy, but the boycott of which the law takes cognizance is synonymous with conspiracy; for boycott is conspiracy."

Yet in the city of my former residence—and I refer to it only as one illustration of many—there was continued, persistent, systematic, wholesale, brazen-faced boycotting formally taken and publicly announced,—another illustration of the lawlessness of the labor union as it operates to-day. One boycott followed another, in the city and vicinity, in quick succession. A photographer rode on a boycotted street car. He was boycotted. A woman rode on a boycotted car to get medicine for a sick member of the family. A labor agitator who saw her get off the car followed her into a drug store and ordered the druggist not to sell her anything. The druggist boycotted the woman to avoid being boycotted himself. The pupils of a public school saw the principal, who lived across the city, get off a boycotted car,

and many of them boycotted him and refused to enter the school house. A minister was known to ride on the cars. His church was called a "scab" church, and some pupils were taken out of the Sunday School. During a miners' strike, a surgeon was viciously assaulted for attempting to attend to the wounds of a non-union mine worker, who had been beaten by a mob of strikers. Non-union class leaders and Sunday School teachers often found their classes vanish, and some choirs refused to sing with a non-union choir leader. People were constantly followed into stores and the proprietors were warned not to sell them anything. These things were done systematically, and instances could be multiplied a hundred or a thousand fold. If one man had done this, there could have been no conspiracy; or if different persons had done the same thing without any concert of action or mutual arrangement or understanding, implied or expressed, it would not have been a conspiracy; but when two or more persons plan or determine to take concerted action with the end in view of influencing and coercing the actions of another or others, to the detriment of a certain individual or individuals, then it becomes

a criminal conspiracy. The boycott, as such a conspiracy, is unlawful, unmanly and un-American. It is unfair and unjust, and is never justifiable.

A labor agitator has recently declared: "The boycott, like trades-unionism, has stood the ravages of time. An outlaw in almost every civilized land, it still thrives against the most strenuous opposition of those whom it injures. No effort to overcome its power by force of law has ever been successful; but, on the contrary, the most powerful opposition seems but to perpetuate its growth." This is the position of the labor union. With the knowledge that boycotting is against the law, this organization not only makes no effort to prevent it, but, from the local body to the national and international organizations, takes formal and official action to establish boycotts times innumerable against individuals and firms they want to force to submit to their dictation under penalty of serious inconvenience and annoyance and heavy loss.

Speaking of the boycott, in an equity proceeding before him, Judge Ferris, of Luzerne

County, Penna., said:[13] "A church, labor union or other association may adopt rules, not contrary to law, regulating the conduct of its members with reference to the legitimate objects of its organization, and they may voluntarily submit to be bound thereby. But to say that any association of individuals, whether a church, labor union or any other, may lawfully prescribe rules of action to govern the conduct of non-members, and enforce those rules by adequate penalties, would be to invest such organization with the powers of government in violation of the organic law which commits those powers exclusively to the constituted authorities of the commonwealth. We would thus be driven to the absurdity of holding that one may lawfully violate law.

"Moreover, if an association may use the power of combination to fetter the freedom of one man, why not of a thousand; if in one instance, why not in a thousand? If one organization may do this, why may not every other? The appalling consequences of carrying this principle to its logical conclusion may well be left to the imagination. That it would

[13]Patterson & Co. *vs.* The Building Trades Council of Wilkes-Barre and others (April, 1902).

be destructive of personal liberty and utterly subversive of all social order, all law, all government, is manifest."

To deny to another man the right to join the labor union or stay out of it, as he may please, peaceably and without restraint, is to endorse anarchy, for it is contrary to the laws of these United States and of every civilized government on the face of the earth.

In March, 1902, the Boston teamsters declared a boycott against a trucking company and then demanded that the railroad and steamship lines should refuse to handle any goods brought to them in this company's trucks. In commenting on the difficulty, at the time, the New York *Tribune* expressed itself on the sympathetic strike and the boycott in language that cannot be misunderstood. Its position is sound in reason, in law and in morals. It said: "Such a demand, of course, could not be granted. The railroad and steamboat companies are common carriers. They are by law obliged to handle the freight that is brought to them. They may dislike the bringer and sympathize with the strikers against him; nevertheless, his right to the equal privileges of public transportation is absolute. It

is a right which those who proclaim themselves the special friends of labor are always seeking to surround with additional safeguards. Transportation corporations, it is demanded, must make no discrimination between customers; they must charge the same rates to all, they must favor nobody, whatever his power or his relation to their business. But, if they must favor nobody, they must also punish nobody. If they can refuse to handle one man's goods because he is boycotted by a labor union, they can refuse to handle another's because he is competing with some friend of the railroad managers. If a railroad can do what the Boston strikers demand, a telegraph company can refuse to transmit the messages of any person on the request of his enemy who has influence with the telegraph directors. The next step is to establish the rule that the Post Office Department must close the mails to any person on petition of organized labor. Nor is it much of a step, either. Labor unions have gone much further in other directions. They have long proclaimed the doctrine that a person under their ban was not entitled to the equal protection of the laws, and declared it out-

rageous that policemen or sheriffs or soldiers should guard him from violence or save his property from destruction.

"This is anarchy. The Boston strikers are acting just as much on anarchist principles as the men who throw bombs. They are demanding that persons against whom they have a grievance be outlawed and that others be freed from performing their legal obligations toward them. If common carriers may not transport a boycotted concern's goods, may the courts try their suits, may the street cars take them as passengers, may the fire department keep their houses from burning down, may the police protect them from assassinations if a labor union sees fit to object? There is no middle ground. The lawful rights of every citizen must be respected, even if he is justly hated by organized labor, or else anarchy reigns, and when individual rights cease to be sacred it is always the poor man who suffers in the end."

The anti-trust law of the United States, approved July 2, 1890, provides in Section 1: "Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be

illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding five thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

In the case of United States *vs.* Workingmen's Amalgamated Council of New Orleans *et al.*,[14] it was held that, if a combination affects interstate commerce, it falls within this act, whether it be a combination of capital or labor. This decision was affirmed by the Federal Court of Appeals.[15] When any union or organization plans to tie up interstate trade or commerce, let it take due notice of this law.

Lawlessness is to be imputed not only to the men who commit it, but also to those who instigate it, to those who permit it, to those who apologize for it, to those who consent to it, to those who could stop it and do not, and to those theories of life that call good evil and evil good.

---

[14] 54 Federal Reporter, p. 994.
[15] 57 Federal Reporter, p. 85.

THE LAW AS TO INJUNCTIONS

We hear much about the injunction. The labor union always condemns it when served on the union. What is it? It is a legal measure designed to warn a man or a body of men who, there is reason to believe, may commit or contemplate committing lawless acts, against the committal of the same, and is designed to be taken only in cases where the ordinary processes at law would prove too slow or insufficient to properly guard the rights, privileges and liberties of the applicant. No man can be enjoined from doing anything that he has a legal right to do. No one but a person who is committing or expects to commit an illegal act has any reason to fear the use of the injunction. The inherent rights of men in all the States of this country are the same. The Constitution of the United States guarantees to every man his rights, and it matters not of what State he may be a citizen. The injunction is not to be issued by the court of equity in cases where there is an adequate remedy at

law. It is to be used only to prevent an irreparable or a continuing injury, in cases where the legal remedy is inadequate, complicated, or ineffective.

The general principles of the injunction were laid down in the following language by Justice Baldwin:[16] "There is no power the exercise of which is more delicate, which requires greater caution, deliberation, and sound discretion, or is more dangerous in a doubtful case, than the issuing an injunction; it is the strong arm of equity, that never ought to be extended, unless to cases of great injury, where courts of law cannot afford an adequate or commensurate remedy in damages. The right must be clear, the injury impending or threatened, so as to be averted only by the protecting preventive process of injunction; but that will not be awarded in doubtful cases, or new ones, not coming within well-established principles; for if it issues erroneously, an irreparable injury is inflicted, for which there can be no redress, it being an act of a court, not of the party who prays for it. It will be refused till the court are satisfied that the case before

[16]Bonaparte *vs.* Camden & A. R. Co., Baldw. 205, 217, Fed. Cas. No. 1617.

it is of a right about to be destroyed, irreparably injured, or great and lasting injury about to be done by an illegal act. In such a case the court owes it to its own suitors and its own principles to administer the only remedy the law allows to prevent the commission of the act."

Punishment for violation of an injunction in no way relieves the violator from legal indictment and punishment for any crime he may commit, in the same act. Mr. Justice Brewer, in delivering the opinion in a case before the Supreme Court of the United States, said:[17] "The proceeding by injunction is of a civil character, and may be enforced by proceedings in contempt; such proceedings are not in execution of the criminal laws of the land; the penalty for a violation of injunction is no substitute for and no defense to a prosecution for any criminal offenses committed in the course of such violation."

In a case of striking molders and their union officials violating an injunction not to interfere with the York, Penna., Manufacturing Company, Judge Stewart, of the County

[17] In re Debs, petitioner, 158 U. S. Reports, 599, 600 (1895).

Court, said, in concluding his opinion: "The York Manufacturing Company is entitled to employ whom it chooses upon such terms as they and it may see fit to agree upon. Workmen have the right to contract with and work for whom they please upon such terms and conditions and for such pay as they may be willing to accept. These are rights which cannot be questioned or denied. They exist in the very nature of things and are written in the constitution of the State, and any person who undertakes by force, menaces or threats, direct or indirect, though cloaked in the softest language, to violate or interrupt them, is guilty of a wrong; and such conduct will be and must be restrained by the courts."

The Supreme Court of the State of Pennsylvania, in an opinion by Justice Brown, April, 1901, continued an injunction issued by the Allegheny County Court restraining the interference by officers of trades unions with the applicant's apprentices. The appellee was the proprietor of glass works in Allegheny County. He complained that the appellants were members of the American Flint Glass Workers' Union and that for a long time he had been hampered in his business by the efforts of the

union to control his workmen and apprentices. Justice Brown said, in his opinion in this case:[18] "The appellee had an unquestioned right in the conduct of his business to employ workmen who were independent of any labor union, and he had the further right to adopt a system of apprenticeship which excluded his apprentices from membership in such a union. He was responsible to no one for his reasons in adopting such a system and no one had a right to interference with it to his prejudice or injury. Such an interference with it was an interference with his business and, if unlawful, cannot be permitted.

"The court found that the interference was injurious to him, and, if allowed to continue, would utterly ruin his business. The damages resulting from such an injury are incapable of ascertainment and law and justice demand that specific relief be furnished in a court of equity. The test of equity jurisdiction is the absence of a plain and adequate remedy at law to the injured party, depending upon the character of the case as disclosed in the pleadings. If equity alone can furnish relief the injunction must be issued. With this

[18]Chas. L. Flaccus *vs.* W. J. Smith, *et al.*

test applied to the pleadings and the facts found by the learned judge in the court below, the decree which he made was proper. It is now affirmed, and the appeal from it dismissed at the cost of the appellants."

In striking and significant contrast with such judicial declarations are the expressions of various labor leaders and writers. A newspaper that caters to the labor unions, in a recent article on the subject, makes the following assertions: "It is true that government by injunction means the trampling under foot of the constitutional rights of American citizenship; the usurpation of rights and privileges not granted by law, and apparently the final overthrow of all law which may stand as an obstacle in the path of those who seem to have the influence to invoke the aid of this powerful legal weapon in the settlement of present-day labor disturbances. . . . Government by injunction, as it is being applied in many courts throughout the country, means government in the interest of the rich and powerful as against the poor and oppressed; and in this it strikes at the very vitals of a republican form of government."

This is not a truthful statement. Either the writer did not know the facts and spoke ignorantly, or he knew the facts and wilfully misrepresented. In either case, he is not worthy of confidence. An injunction does not and cannot prohibit any man, rich or poor, from doing what he has any right to do. It prohibits only that which is unlawful; and no exception can be taken to its operation in general, except by those whose acts or purposes are contrary to the law of the land. The labor agitator opposes it because it has been employed many times to warn strikers who are menacing, threatening and terrorizing men at work or who want to work. This the strikers have no right to do under any circumstances, regardless of the injunction. In times of labor disturbances and strikes, where there is lawlessness, annoyance and threats, the ordinary processes of the law are entirely too slow and too inadequate to meet the emergency. The labor agitator wants the striker given full sweep during a strike to picket, to follow, to "persuade," to "influence" and to threaten; and to do this in such large numbers and with such an impressive display of force that it will induce the workman, against his personal will

and purpose, to abandon work. The striker, with his demands, looks as a mortal enemy upon the man who is contented with the conditions under which he is working. The labor union that seeks to control the entire field of service, not by winning through attraction, but by compulsion, wants to force every free workman, whether he likes it or not, to bow submissively to its mandates; and this will never be tolerated in this country.

The appropriateness of the injunction was discussed by the court in the case of Patterson & Co. *vs.* The Building Trades Council of Wilkes-Barre and others, restraining them from proclaiming against the plaintiffs a boycott that "no union man, member of any local connected with the Building Trades Council, will be allowed, either directly or indirectly, to work on any building" on which the plaintiffs did work or for which they furnished any materials. Judge Ferris said on this point: "The inherent and indefeasible rights of enjoying liberty, of acquiring property and of pursuing one's own happiness, necessarily include the right to conduct a lawful business in a lawful manner without interference by others, save by a fair competition or other lawful means.

"The remedy by injunction is peculiarly applicable to the case at bar: (1) because the plaintiffs' business is lawful and their right to conduct it in their own way is clear; (2) because the acts complained of are unlawful and prejudicial to the rights of the plaintiffs; (3) because the injury is irreparable—the business of which the plaintiffs have been deprived is gone and the natural tendency and effect of a continuance of the acts complained of will be to prevent the obtaining of new business to take its place; (4) because the plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law. 'It is true they might bring their respective actions against the defendants for damages for injury already occasioned them, but this affords them no security against the recurrence of such acts in the future, and the very multiplicity of the suits at law which would be necessitated by the state of facts is of itself a sufficient ground to warrant the interposition of the strong arm of the chancellor.'[19]

"Nor is the fact (if it be a fact) that the defendants are amenable to criminal prosecution fatal to the remedy by injunction. As said by Mr. Justice Strong, in Sparhawk *vs.* Union

[19]Erdmann *vs.* Mitchell.

Passenger Railway:[20] 'The objection is plausible rather than substantial. It is true that equity does not generally enjoin against crime as a crime; but the books are full of cases in which an injunction has been decreed against acts injurious to individuals, though they have also amounted to a crime against the public.' An adjudication to the same effect by the highest authority may be found *in re* Debs."[21]

It is thus to be seen that the injunction,—which, as a matter of fact, is used against corporations from time to time, as well as against labor organizations—prohibits, denies and curtails no man's rights in any respect. It is issued simply to protect a man or a number of men in the use and the enjoyment of what the Constitution and the laws of this country guarantee to every citizen alike.

[20] 54 Penna., 401-413.
[21] 158 U. S. Reports, p. 564.

THE LABOR UNION AND THE MILITIA

The labor unions for a number of years have been protesting against the calling out of the National Guard or other military forces to suppress violence, rioting and disorder in time of strike. Immediately after a strikers' mob of a hundred, a thousand, or several thousand people have terrorized a community or a district, by assault, destruction of property, or even murder, the labor unions usually disclaim all responsibility for the lawlessness and assure the public that the local authorities can maintain the peace,—though sometimes not a mayor, councilman, or policeman can be found, making any successful effort to restore order. This is one of the serious problems connected with strikes. I know of a town, in time of strike, without a policeman on duty. I know of districts in which the constable or the justice of the peace was not only in sympathy with the rioting strikers and their followers, but actually participated in the vio-

lence. I have known of justices who refused to issue warrants for violators of the law. I have known of districts so "sympathetic" with the strikers on the one hand, or so terrorized on the other, that the officers of the law, the school boards and teachers, the storekeepers and the clergy yielded, more or less unwillingly, to its sway rather than face the inevitable opposition, the boycott, ostracism and loss of position and influence, if not physical danger. Experiences such as these are not confined to any one community, any one industry, or any one State; and life, under such conditions, becomes almost unbearable.

Even in communities where the sentiment of the better classes and the ruling majority is sufficiently law-abiding to bring law-breakers to the courts, the attorney for the defense strives to get union men on the jury; and these jurymen see that their "brother" escapes with acquittal, if it is by any means possible. I know of a verdict of acquittal where the defendant admitted his guilt. Any non-union workmen or men who have worked during a strike, who may be witnesses for the prosecution, are held up for the derision of "honest labor,"—*i. e.,* the "honest labor" on the jury;

and thus the law is broken and the law-breaker goes free. The compensation of the attorney who defends the strikers may be—as it already has been—his election to an important office in the gift of the people, in communities where the labor unions are strong enough to hold the balance of power. The man who testifies against a union man's lawlessness in time of strike runs the risk of a merciless boycott, that threatens to drive him out of business, if not out of the community.

The question that must be faced is, How are the rights and liberties guaranteed to every citizen of the commonwealth to be preserved at such a time and under such circumstances? When the officers of the law and the local courts, particularly in the jury trial, are all under the baneful influence of the law-breakers, how are a man's constitutional rights to be secured and the public peace maintained? It is commonly the case in such a union community, moreover, that, even where a large number of arrests have been made on account of lawlessness and riot, personal assaults and violence, after the long delay that almost invariably ensues before reaching formal, final trial, nearly all—if not all—such cases are

dropped without trial or sentence, as the strike has terminated and there is a feeling among many that it is better to let by-gones be by-gones. The moral effect of such action is that when the next strike occurs strikers have less hesitation than before in breaking the law. They have been given good reason to believe that they will be immune from punishment. Our laws, however, are not enacted to be kept only in time of peace, when everybody is willing that they should be observed, and then to be deliberately disregarded and systematically broken just at a time when law is needed.

The union workmen, in striking, deliberately abandon their work in mill or mine. They assert they will not work any longer in the positions they have been filling, under the conditions, with the wages, for the hours, or with the other workmen, as heretofore. It may be, as has so often happened, that they have gone out on strike to demand that the employer reinstate some one discharged. It may be that there is no dissatisfaction of any kind in any way with the positions they have been filling; but they have abandoned their work and gone out on strike because the employer is selling the product of his establishment to some indi-

vidual or firm against whom the union has established a boycott. It may be, as has often been the case, that they have gone out on strike because their employer has purchased some material from a plant they have boycotted. It may be the bituminous coal operator is shipping his coal into a section of the State where, ordinarily, anthracite is used, but where none of that can now be had on account of a strike. The labor union has arrogantly claimed the right to say whether the people and the manufactories of that community are to be supplied with bituminous coal or not, under threat of a strike in the soft coal regions: as if the labor union were to determine the rights of an individual or a community to the enjoyment of life and the purchase of whatever it or they may need or desire in the open market. For such reason, or for no reason, the union workmen throw down their tools and give up their places. If some men in the establishment want to continue work, if non-union men refuse to quit at the dictation of a body to which they do not belong and do not want to belong, or if the employer secures other workmen to guard his property and run his plant, the union at once takes heroic measures to get such men

to quit work against their will,—by strong language, if that is sufficient, or, if not, then by physical force and violence, if necessary, and they have the opportunity to do so. It is not a question of the strikers being "irritated" by the employers and angered by the police and "roused to desperation by the scab" laborers who are willing to work. The strikers have had all this in view from the moment they went on strike. They calculate on it. They have to expect it. They do expect it, and they plan for it. Their attitude is, "We won't work, and we won't let any one else work." The assertion that this is a deliberate, premeditated and systematic denial of the American principle and law of equal rights for every man is self-evident. It is the usurpation of a power to boycott, to assault, to shoot, to lynch, that does not belong even to the highest *constituted* powers of the government of the country; and the American people will not indefinitely and tamely submit to such domination of a self-constituted and irresponsible power that is being rapidly developed within our borders.

In times of riot and bloodshed, where the local authorities have not been able to preserve the peace, the State has been compelled to send

the military to assist the local officers of the law in restoring and maintaining order. This has invariably brought forth protests from the labor agitators and the unions as "unnecessary and unwarranted." They object to any protection being given to any persons who will not yield submissively to their dictum and their demands, however reasonable, unreasonable, or even ridiculous the demands themselves may be, or however lawless and shameless they may be in their methods of enforcing their demands.

In furtherance of their aims, regardless of the means employed, different labor unions have taken formal action prohibiting their members from belonging to the militia, as they have found that that body stands for the maintenance of law and is, therefore, a hostile factor in the winning of strikes by lawlessness. Though the labor agitators and leaders constantly protest that the mobs are not composed of union men, but are made up of thugs and tramps, yet these labor agitators are the only ones who complain about such lawlessness being interfered with by the military. When these "thugs" and "tramps" destroy property, assault workmen, interfere with public traffic

and commerce and attack the great and disinterested third party, why, then, does the labor union object to the nefarious work being interfered with? As a matter of fact, the agitators know full well, as does every one else who is familiar with the make-up of strikers' mobs, that the rioters are, in the first place, union men and their sympathizers; though they may and naturally do attract by their violence the riff-raff and the scum of the neighborhood.

The citizen soldiery are called out, in time of domestic violence, to serve the State, to protect the lives, the property and the constitutional rights of a community. If the employers and the men who want to work should organize and form a mob and attack the men who do not want to work, and assault them, beat them, shoot at them, hang and burn them in effigy, boycott them and dynamite their homes, and if the local civil authorities were unable to maintain the public peace, the same troops would be ordered out for exactly the same purpose,—to protect the lives and the property and all the rights of all the people of the community. It is not surprising that an organization using lawlessness as one of its

most effective means to accomplish its ends should denounce the efforts that are made to maintain the law and should prohibit its membership—as it is doing more and more—from being or becoming members of the military forces of the State. This cannot be considered in any other light than as an insidious attack upon republican institutions.

The position of the labor unions, that the militia stands opposed to them, is shown by the following article, from the pen of a labor agitator, appearing in one of our Eastern newspapers: "True, trades-unionism has reached a height, so far as pertains to members, never before attained. We now have a membership, high and away beyond the greatest expectations of those who introduced this system of protection to labor into this country. Such strength in numbers, in fact, as could sweep every opposition from its path. But trades-unionism stands to-day, like a vast army in battle array, trained in the tactics of modern warfare, but held at bay by an insignificant force, because the latter is equipped with the weapons of modern warfare."

Admit that labor unions are lawless, and it can be truly admitted at the same time that

the militia stands opposed to them. The militia is not opposed to the union laborer, but to the union laborer's lawlessness, just as it stands opposed to lawlessness from any other quarter. We want more manhood in the labor unions, more patriotism and more regard for law and order.

The Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' Association adopted the following amendment to their constitution: "Any person a member of the regular army or navy or of the State militia or naval reserves shall not be eligible to membership in this Association. Any member of this Association who shall become a member of either of the above-named bodies must tender his resignation of membership to the Association at once." Another clause added that this provision should not apply either in the case of the National Guard or the regular army when this country is at war with a foreign foe.

The Painters' and Paper Hangers' Union, at a general convention held in Detroit, Mich., in December, 1901, adopted a constitution one article of which states that the candidate for admission to that union shall not be a militiaman, special police officer or deputy marshal

in the employ of corporations or individuals during strikes, lockouts or other labor difficulties; "and any member occupying any of the above positions shall be debarred from membership." A member of a local union of this organization in Schenectady, N. Y., served as a militiaman during the Hudson Valley Street Railway strike, and, as a result, was expelled from the union and boycotted. At the demand of the union, he was discharged from the service of his employers. Any employer who might employ him was threatened with the boycott. This attitude of the union against military service for the State has been well termed an attack upon the right of free labor, upon the right of free employment, upon citizenship, and upon the sovereignty of the State.

In the light of such an experience, the Legislature of the State of New York passed the following law:[22] "A person who, either by himself or with another, wilfully deprives a member of the National Guard of his employment, or prevents his being employed by himself or another, or obstructs or annoys said member of said National Guard, or his employer, in respect of his trade, business, or

[22]Session Laws of 1903, Chap. 349.

employment, because said member of said National Guard is such member, or dissuades any person from enlistment in the said National Guard by threat of injury to him in case he shall so enlist, in respect of his employment, trade, or business, is guilty of a misdemeanor.

"No association or corporation, constituted or organized for the purpose of promoting the success of the trade, employment, or business of the members thereof, shall by any constitution, rule, by-law, resolution, vote, or regulation, discriminate against any member of the National Guard of the State of New York, because of such membership in respect of the eligibility of such member of the said National Guard to membership in such association or corporation, or in respect of his right to retain said last-mentioned membership; it being the purpose of this section and the section immediately preceding to protect a member of the said National Guard from disadvantage in his means of livelihood and liberty therein, but not to give him any preference or advantage on account of his membership of said National Guard. A person who aids in enforcing any such provisions against a member of the said National Guard with the intent to discriminate

against him because of such membership, is guilty of a misdemeanor."

A Scranton, Penna., local Painters' and Paper Hangers' Union expelled one of its members on account of his military service for the State; and officers of the National Guard asserted that there were numbers of cases where men had to be discharged upon their own request to avoid troubles with their unions and thus be prevented from making a livelihood; and not only with one union, but with different ones.

During the historic miners' strike of 1902, one of the cities in the anthracite field reported: "The Eighth Regiment was called out on July 30th. Many mine employes belonged to it; but they all responded to the midnight summons. Strikers gathered near the armory. Each member, as he came to report, was hooted and vilified. As one company left the armory, their companions and neighbors yelled 'scab' at them. This was too much for one of the soldiers. He stepped from the ranks and struck one of the vilifiers a blow which floored him. . . . The soldiers who are union men may be excommunicated from the union.

Many of them will voluntarily leave the company as soon as peace is restored."

Another of the many evidences of the attitude of the labor union toward the militia was the passage, on April 19, 1901, of the following resolutions by Local Union No. 519, United Mine Workers of America, of Scranton, Penna.: "Whereas, It has come to our notice that the councils of this city in appropriating money for the current expenses of the several departments thereof for the ensuing year, are asked to contribute the sum of $2,000 of the taxpayers' money towards the maintenance of a certain military organization known as the National Guards of Pennsylvania . . .

"Resolved, That we request those members who favor the misappropriating of the people's money for this purpose to reconsider their action at the next meeting of their body and thus place themselves on record as being opposed to maintaining a standing army in the interests of corporations and monopoly and to the detriment of honest labor. . . ."

A local paper had the courage to give expression to the truth, in stating: "The Thirteenth Regiment is no more a standing army in the interests of corporations and mo-

nopoly than it is one in the interest of the United Mine Workers of America; and no more a detriment to honest labor than is the Scranton police force. It exists to defend the Commonwealth in case of riot or invasion, and to assist, in extreme emergencies, in enforcing the menaced law. Only those who are or expect to be lawless have any reason to fear either the National Guard or the police; and certainly honest labor neither is lawless nor has any expectation of ever becoming lawless."

For any men or organizations of men to deny the right and the duty of citizens to bear arms in allegiance to the State is to conspire against that allegiance to the Commonwealth which anarchists denounce; yet a systematic campaign of the unions against the enlistment of men to fill the militia regiments has been reported in different parts of the country. This is an effort to establish within the State a power higher than the State and antagonistic to it. It not only has the tendency but is an effort to deny highest allegiance to the State and to hold aloof from a loyal support of our government; in short, to keep hands free in contemplation of future insurrection. Some labor leaders, indeed,—but they are the excep-

tions to the rule,—urge that it is better for the members of the union who are in sympathy with its plans and purposes to compose the militia than for other persons who are perhaps antagonistic to them.

THE LABOR UNION AND INCORPORATION

A large number of States have statutes permitting the incorporation of trade-unions, but thus far there have been but the rarest instances of such incorporation. A man has the liberty and the right to join any labor organization he may wish; and he has the privilege of refusing to join. An employer cannot be constitutionally forbidden to employ a non-union man or to discharge a union man, unless, at the same time and under the same conditions, the law forbids the employment of a union man or the discharge of a non-union man. Union labor and non-union labor must stand or fall together, in statutory enactment, to hold. The leaders of the union want power, but they wish to avoid the full responsibility of that power. Incorporation might lead to scrutiny of the benefit and insurance funds of the union. It might lead to litigation. The unincorporated union is liable for damages, it must be borne in mind, if it commits, or sanc-

tions and aids in the commission of a positively unlawful act. It cannot, however, as an unincorporated organization, be sued for breach of contract. This is the reason why it has no fair claim to demand or expect contracts with incorporated and responsible employers. The one side can be held to the contract; the other cannot be. New York, Connecticut, Michigan and New Jersey, at least, have passed statutes making voluntary associations liable to be sued in the name of their officers. There are some clear advantages to be secured to the labor union by incorporation. As such, they can sue, hold property, and do all those things which an individual can do under the provisions applicable to corporations; and the liability of a member is limited by law. As a rule, the members of an unincorporated association are individually liable for the debts of the association, like partners in a firm.

An interesting and quite recent case in which the union as a body was held subject to penalty is that of the Chicago Typothetæ *vs.* Franklin Union No. 4. The Chicago Typothetæ, an employers' association, had made a contract with the unincorporated organization

of employes known as Franklin Union No. 4, with reference to a wage scale, to be in effect from April 1, 1901, to December 31, 1901. The scale tacitly continued in force nearly two years after its original term, when it was declared annulled by the Franklin Union September 27, 1903. On October 10th following, an injunction was secured by the employers forbidding the union, its officers and other defendants "in any manner to interfere with, hinder, obstruct, or stop any of the business of the complainants"; and also forbidding interference with employes by threats or intimidation, force or violence, or in like manner preventing persons from freely entering into and continuing in the service and employment of the complainants. Several months later, upon evidence showing a number of assaults and other violent and threatening acts committed by persons occupying official positions in the union and drawing strike benefits from its treasury, Judge Jesse Holdom, of the court in question, adjudged the union guilty of contempt, assessing a fine of $1,000.

In the case of Curran *vs.* Galen,[23] the plaintiff obtained judgment for damages in a suit

[23] 46 N. E. Rep., 297.

against the officers of an unincorporated labor organization in the State of New York under a statute authorizing such suit, on the ground that he had been deprived of employment by the action of the union, of which he was not a member.

The Ohio courts have held in several cases that a trade-union and its agents and members are jointly liable for damages caused by combinations that injure others by boycotts and interferences with trade.[24]

Probably the most famous case on this point, and one that has attracted world-wide attention, comes from across the sea. It is that of the Taff Vale Railway Co. *vs.* The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants. As a result of some difficulty between the Railroad Company and its employes, a large number of the latter went on strike in August, 1900, without giving proper notice to terminate their agreements. The strike lasted several weeks and was eventually settled through the good offices of the Board of Trade. Twelve hundred men were ordered by the union to picket the Railroad Company's line and property.

[24]See Parker *vs.* Bricklayers' Union, 21 O. L. B., 223; and Moore *vs.* Same, 23 O. L. B., 48.

While this strike was in progress, the Railroad Company applied for an injunction against two officers of the union, who were leaders in the strike, to restrain them from "watching and besetting" the Cardiff railway station and adjacent property on the ground that it was a violation of law. The Amalgamated Society strenuously opposed the granting of this writ of injunction on the ground that the Society was not a corporation or an individual, and therefore could not be sued in a quasi-corporate or any other capacity and that an action in tort would not lie. Mr. Justice Farwell conceded, on the one hand, that a trade-union is neither a corporation, nor an individual, nor a partnership between a number of individuals, but held, on the other hand, that a trade-union is a corporate body and as such is qualified to sue and be sued; and that the funds in its possession can be attached in payment of damages for illegal acts committed by its officials.

The union carried the case up to the Court of Appeals, where it was heard before the Master of the Rolls and Lord Justices Collins and Sterling, in November, 1900. The unanimous decision of this court was that a union

cannot be sued as such, and the injunction was ordered dissolved.

The plaintiffs then appealed to the House of Lords,—the highest judicial tribunal of the British Empire; and their decision, rendered in July, 1902, overruled the Court of Appeals and sustained Mr. Justice Farwell in his view that a trade-union is a legal entity, capable of suing and being sued. The Lord Chancellor said: "If the legislature has created a thing which can own property, which can employ servants, and which can inflict injury, it must be taken, I think, to have impliedly given power to make it suable in the courts of law for injuries purposely done by its authority and procurance."

In consequence of this decision, the Taff Vale Railway Company brought suit against the union for £28,000 damages. This suit was decided December 20, 1902, in favor of the plaintiffs,—the exact amount of damages to be passed on later. Three questions were left to the decision of the jury: First, whether the defendants had conspired to unlawfully molest and injure the plaintiffs; Second, whether the defendants had unlawfully persuaded the men to break their contracts;

Third, whether the defendants had authorized and assisted in carrying on the strike by unlawful means. The Justice called attention to the fact that conspiracy consists in concerted action rather than in the concert to act by two or more persons to produce a common end, and it might be unlawful in two ways: to compass a lawful end by unlawful means, or to compass an unlawful end.

Under this English decision, it was declared that the entering into an agreement by an unincorporated trade-union renders each individual member liable for any damages resulting from breach of contract, like the different members of a co-partnership.

The British parliament has recently enacted a measure giving to labor unions special privileges and immunities; but, as a general and universal principle of law and justice, it may be said that any organization of men anywhere—just as any man as an individual—must be held accountable before the law for its acts and the consequences thereof.

PART II

LABOR AND CHRISTIANITY

Labor is the law of life. From the beginning of the human race to the present time, labor has been a condition of health, of happiness and of general prosperity. So far as this result of it is concerned, the curse in connection with the departure from Paradise was a blessing in disguise. Death ensued on account of sin, with all its terrible penalties; but the solemn decree "in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground," conveyed a message of goodness and love.

Labor is a law of health. Regular, systematic, vigorous labor promotes health. It puts color in the cheek, fire in the eye, solidity in the bone and strength in the muscle. It clears the intellect, whets the appetite, purifies the blood, develops endurance and adds in every way to the sum of human happiness. No person can long continue in a perfect state of

health without labor or its equivalent in exercise and recreation. The man who complains he has to work for a living does not understand the laws of his own being. He should rather rejoice because he has work, and thank God for its possession and the blessings it brings.

Labor is, again, a law of wealth. There are some exceptions to every rule, but the former only prove the latter. Barring such exceptions, it is only those who have labored who have received the reward of riches in this world. Some people make the singular mistake of assuming that nothing is labor except that which is done by strength of brawn and bone. Nothing could be more erroneous. The training and the study, the investigation and the distinguishing thought of the scholar and logician, the writer and theologian, the statesman and practitioner at the bar, or the great teacher, and the mind trained and occupied in the management of many men in commerce, in manufacture or in other industry, with its anxious care and responsibilities all entail a wear and tear on the nervous and physical energy far beyond the daily round of duties performed by one under definite and detailed

instruction. All that is necessary to prove the truth of this statement is to try it. It proves itself.

The men who have made their mark in the financial world and work have been and are the men who toil; and the harder and the longer the toil the greater the success. The successful man does not come from the circle of those who want to do as little work as possible, as carelessly and as inefficiently as possible, but from among those who struggle and strive and toil to make themselves second to none in their business or in their occupation. If you want success, make yourself efficient, and more efficient and capable every month; do the very best work in your line that can be done; do as much of it as possible in a given time; work as many hours as any one else can; be a man in all your dealings with men; be faithful in all that your hands find to do; and, as surely as day follows the night, so surely will success crown your efforts. You will always have work; you will have a good reputation; you will have the best wages the market can give; and you will have the consciousness of being a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. This class of labor never needs to

strike. This class of labor never strikes. It is this class of labor that maintains the permanency of our institutions and represents the moral and industrial backbone of our country. This class of men rises year by year. The laborer of yesterday is the skilled artisan of to-day. The employe of yesterday is the employer to-day. The clerk of yesterday is the merchant to-day. The machinist's helper of yesterday is the well-known manufacturer to-day. The farmer's boy of yesterday is the practitioner at the bar to-day. The miner of yesterday is the coal operator to-day. The plodding dunce of yesterday is the literary light to-day. All know and must admit that labor, with energy and persistence, with intelligence and fidelity, brings its success also in wealth.

In the parable of the talents, Christ gives us the divine law: "For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away."[25] Two men to whom talents had been entrusted proved faithful in their use and were able to give a good report. A third one to whom a

[25]Matt. xxv: 29.

talent was given despised its use, buried it in the ground and proved a worthless, indifferent and idle trustee. He was judged out of his own mouth. When the reckoning time came, the talent that he had never used was ordered taken from him and given to another man who had proved faithful in using his talents; and the faithless one was given the sentence: "And cast ye out the unprofitable servant into the outer darkness; there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth."[26] The relative rewards of slothfulness and industry are here clearly depicted; and, as long as the law of the Lord and the law of nature rule over the earth, that long will one man work harder and receive more than another. Life is not given to man for a round of pleasure and idleness, but for the best and highest capacities of his being. Like the unfaithful servant in the parable of the talents, too many people to-day decry the rich and industrious and denounce others who are faithful, as the cause of their failure; but the eternal decree is that every man shall be rewarded according to his work.[27]

But labor is also the law of happiness.

[26]Matt. xxv: 30.
[27]See Matt. xvi: 27.

Nothing drives dull care away like regular work. Continued idleness, voluntary or enforced, brings dissatisfaction, worry, anxiety and distress. Labor is the law of the universe. Nothing has been created without a purpose, even in the inanimate world. The bee, the squirrel and the ant urge man on to a life of industry. Of man it is written: "To him therefore that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin."[28] From the time of our first parents, and at the giving of the decalogue on Mount Sinai we have the positive command of God: "Six days shalt thou labor";[29] and from later ages, we read: "In all labor there is profit";[30] "The labor of the righteous tendeth to life";[31] "He also that is slack in his work is brother to him that is a destroyer."[32]

Once more, it is true that labor is not only a criterion of character, but it affects character. The truth of the old adage that Satan finds work for idle hands to do is proven every day. Idleness begets crime. The men who shun

[28]James iv: 17.
[29]Ex. xx: 9.
[30]Prov. xiv: 23.
[31]Prov. x: 16.
[32]Prov. xviii: 9.

honest work will find other ways—dishonest ways—of securing a living. The gambler, the thief, the sponger, the murderer for pelf, the man who seeks to live off his wits, the boodler and the briber are only another step beyond the loafer and the beggar. The ideal condition of society is work; work for everybody, and everybody at his work. Some men will not work, except under compulsion. Some other men are so indifferent and inefficient about their work or so lazy and indolent that their services are not desirable and therefore not desired by any one. No man has any claim on society to be kept, if he is able to work and will not. The New Testament law is that if a man will not work, neither shall he eat. Some men maintain that these lazy men are to be kept and supported by the industrious; but, inasmuch as the advocates of this doctrine want to be kept rather than keep others, the suggestion finds no sympathy among the industrious, the judicious and the intelligent of this free country. "Slothfulness casteth into a deep sleep; and the idle soul shall suffer hunger."[33]

We have seen that labor is the law of the natural or physical life. It brings health, hap-

[33]Prov. xix: 15.

piness and prosperity; it affects character. The lazy loafer, the shirker, is not keeping God's law. A man is to work not merely because he may need to in order to secure the necessaries and the comforts of life; but he is to work that the world may be the better for his example and the richer for his service. However rich a man may be, therefore, he is to labor, not merely for his own health's sake, but for his country's sake and that of his fellowmen. It has been the history of all time that the successful men, the moral men, the men of sound principle, the men who have made the world better for their being in it, are the men who have worked hard and persistently. The men who have been the patriots of every land, the great inventors, the great builders, architects, musicians, writers, philanthropists, and the great professional men have been the men who have worked incessantly and indefatigably. George Washington, "the Father of his Country," was an example of industry. Abraham Lincoln was a rail splitter and then a grocer; but he was ambitious, industrious and persevering. General Grant was a poor boy; but by dint of labor he rose to the highest position in the gift of the American people.

Vice-President Wilson was so poor that we are told he never spent the amount of one dollar in money, counting every penny, from the time he was born until he was twenty-one years of age. Horace Greeley was poor and, at first, unsuccessful; but he founded the New York *Tribune* and made it worth a million dollars. Hard work was the secret of his success. David Livingstone, Christian missionary, explorer and discoverer, began to work in a cotton factory when he was ten years old. After working hard all day, he went to school at night until he was fitted to enter college. Even there he paid his own way. He crossed the dark and unknown continent of Africa its length and then its breadth, finally returning to the center of the great cross his footsteps had formed, to kneel down in a miserable hut and yield up his soul to God in the attitude of prayer. He opened up the needs of a continent to the eyes of the world. His body lies buried to-day in Westminster Abbey. More than one hundred years ago, there lived in Oxford, England, a little boy who was so poor that he blacked the boots of the students at the university so as to get money to buy food. Some of the students became interested in him

and taught him. He astonished them at the rate at which he learned. That boy became one of the founders of the Methodist church, —George Whitefield.

Yet we hear men complaining that they do not have a chance. Let them but work half as hard as they loaf and half as hard as they complain, and they will make something of themselves. All the men who have worthily held the higher positions and responsibilities of life *worked,* and they were not afraid of it. They worked not only during hours, but before and after hours as well. The secret of the successful life is not to see how little work one can do, but how much. The avowed aim of some men to-day to get the highest wage for the least possible work will not be successful, for it is contrary to the gospel, and it is contrary, too, to all human experience, as well as to sound logic and reasoning. Diana in mythology was chaste because she was never idle, but constantly busy hunting. Even the bees will not tolerate the lazy drone, but kill him and throw him out of the hive. There is a Turkish proverb that the devil tempts all other men, but that idle men tempt the devil. Genius, as some one has said, is only the ca-

pacity for hard work. If you are not satisfied with what you are and what you have already done, work harder and more intelligently.

"If any will not work, neither let him eat. For we hear of some that walk among you disorderly, that work not at all, but are busybodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread."[34] The Bible says you are to work and this government says you may work; and then, in time of strike and boycott a mob of villains attack and assault you with fists, stones, clubs or pistols on your way to work, or at your place of business, or perhaps dynamite your home, and yell: "You shan't work." It is time for such lawless men to know that they are acting not only as enemies to their country and their fellowmen, but they are acting directly as minions of Satan. Men must learn to know that the only way to succeed in life is through hard work; through attending to one's own business; through encouraging other people to work; through making work-

[34]II Thess. iii: 10-12.

men more efficient and more faithful; through co-operating with employers; through being peaceful, law-abiding citizens.

"Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord: whatsoever ye do, work heartily, as unto the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance; ye serve the Lord Christ. For he that doeth wrong shall receive again for the wrong that he hath done; and there is no respect of persons. Masters, render unto your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven."[35]

"Exhort servants to be in subjection to their own masters, and to be well-pleasing to them in all things; not gainsaying; not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity; that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things."[36]

---

[35]Col. iii: 22—iv: 1.
[36]Titus ii: 9, 10.

"Servants, be in subjection to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward."[37]

The agitator and the disturber of other people's business is given a rebuke and an exhortation by the Apostle Paul: "But we exhort you, brethren, . . . that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your hands, even as we charged you."[38] Men of all classes and stations, employes and employers alike, are not only recommended but commanded to keep themselves out of the company and association of the disorderly, the troublesome and the lawless. "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which they received of us."[39] Disturbers of the public peace and of individual contentment would find very little following if all others followed this injunction of the great apostle to the Gentiles.

---

[37] I Peter ii: 18.
[38] I Thess. iv: 11.
[39] II Thess. iii: 6.

As for those who have not yet learned this lesson of fidelity and co-operation in industrial affairs and constant loyalty and obedience to the powers of the State and do not want to learn it—whether atheists or professing Christians, whether foreigners or Americans, whether clothed with a very little brief authority as labor agitators and business agents, or their followers and sympathizers—it will be necessary at least to enforce the laws without fear or favor.

The New Testament teaching of Paul above quoted[40] also purposes that men shall eat their own bread. The honest, able-bodied workman does not want help from the community, —by way of charity; and he does not want such help from other workmen. He wants work. In Thessalonica, these busybodies and gossipers—professing Christians, teachers and exhorters, though they were—were not to be supported or encouraged by their fellow-Christians. And there would be fewer strikes, and the few there would be would be much shorter if the labor unions did not have so many and such well-paid agitators and officers; or else if these agitators were paid like doctors

[40] II Thess. iii: 10-12.

of medicine are paid in some places in the Orient. Their regular salary ceases the day their patron becomes a patient and is discontinued as long as the illness continues.

The dignity of labor and of service is a truth of which the world must not lose sight. The highest life on earth is the one spent in serving the men for whom Christ died. Jesus Christ Himself says unto those who follow Him: "The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so; but he that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve."[41] Christ lived the life He taught. "For verily the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."[42] "And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted."[43]

We are to labor for the health of the body; but labor yet more for the health of the soul. It is right and proper to make honest en-

[41]Luke xxii: 25, 26.
[42]Mark x: 45.
[43]Matt. xxiii: 12.

deavors to lay by for the necessities of this life; but it is of infinitely greater importance to lay up treasures for the life to come. It is not unreasonable to consider the comforts of the world; but we must not forget for one moment that the world is of secondary consequence. The exhortation of Jesus Christ: "But seek ye first His kingdom, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you,"[44] shows that the thing of supreme importance, the duty of first importance, is to be sure of the eternal. The things of this world are so uncertain; they last such a short time; they soon slip away from us. "But the things which are not seen are eternal."[45] "Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you."[46]

Let us do the first thing first. Let us be sure that we attend to the duties of greatest importance first. William Carey, the renowned missionary, said, in reply to a question as to what his business was: "My business is to save souls; but I cobble shoes for a living"; and

---

[44]Matt. vi: 33.
[45]II Cor. iv: 18.
[46]John vi: 27.

what an admirable reply it was! Your business, too, my friend, is to save souls. You may be a merchant, a clerk, a professional man, a housewife, a domestic, or a teacher; but never forget that that is simply your means of making a living. Your BUSINESS is to save souls. The chief end of your life is to glorify God and serve your eternal King. "For we are God's fellow-workers."[47] The German philosopher Hegel expressed it in these words: "Christianity is the pivot of the world. On it the world turns. To it all history tends. From it all history proceeds." The most important thing about any man or about any nation is his or its religion. "For what shall a man be profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and forfeit his life? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his life?"[48] You are to pray "Thy kingdom come," but you are to do more than that. You are to pray: "Thy will be done"; and YOU are to do it.

In the travels of the Apostle Paul, he came to Ephesus and built up the church by his preaching and teaching and the miracles that were performed through him. Because he

[47]I Cor. iii: 9.
[48]Matt. xvi: 26.

preached Jesus Christ and condemned the worship of idols, the workmen who were engaged in the manufacture of idols feared their business would be affected and they would lose their trade. "And about that time there arose no small stir concerning the Way. For a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines of Diana, brought no little business unto the craftsmen; whom he gathered together, with the workmen of like occupation, and said: 'Sirs, ye know that by this business we have our wealth. And ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made with hands: and not only is there danger that this our trade come into disrepute; but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana be made of no account, and that she should even be deposed from her magnificence, whom all Asia and the world worshipeth.' And when they heard this, they were filled with wrath, and cried out, saying, 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians.' And the city was filled with the confusion: and they rushed with one accord into the theatre, having

seized Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel."[49]

Paul's friends restrained him from presenting himself. Some cried one thing, and some another; for the assembly was in confusion; and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together. The tumult lasted several hours in disorder. When the town clerk had quieted the multitude, he appealed to them to be quiet and to do nothing rash, saying: "If therefore Demetrius, and the craftsmen that are with him, have a matter against any man, the courts are open, and there are proconsuls: let them accuse one another. But if ye seek anything about other matters, it shall be settled in the regular assembly. For indeed we are in danger to be accused concerning this day's riot, there being no cause for it: and as touching it, we shall not be able to give account of this concourse."[50]

We are here taught a lesson as to our duty to act like men when we have grievances, imaginary or real, against others. We have courts established for this very purpose. If contracts have been broken and agreements

[49]Acts xix: 23-29.
[50]Acts xix: 38-40.

have been violated, we have our recourse. Let us be men, and submit our differences to the powers that be.

Christ teaches us a lesson of the unmanliness of deliberately agreeing to work for a specified sum and then expressing dissatisfaction and discontent when we are paid, because, perchance, the employer has seen fit to give some one else more wages per hour, at the same work. "For the kingdom of heaven," He said, "is like unto a man that is a householder, which went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard. And when he had agreed with the laborers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard. And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing in the marketplace idle; and to them he said, 'Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right I will give you.' And they went their way. Again he went out about the sixth and the ninth hour, and did likewise. And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing; and he saith unto them, 'Why stand ye here all the day idle?' They say unto him, 'Because no man hath hired us.' He saith unto them, 'Go ye also into the vineyard.'

And when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, 'Call the laborers, and pay them their hire, beginning from the last unto the first.' And when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny. And when the first came, they supposed that they would receive more; and they likewise received every man a penny. And when they received it, they murmured against the householder, saying, 'These last have spent but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden of the day and the scorching heat.' But he answered and said to one of them, 'Friend, I do thee no wrong; didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take up that which is thine, and go thy way; it is my will to give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Or is thine eye evil, because I am good?' "[51]

That is the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. Every man is a steward of God. He has been given brain and brawn, and perhaps some little wealth besides, to be used for the uplifting of the world. For his use, misuse or

[51]Matt. xx: 1-15.

abuse of those talents, he will have to render an account at the last great day to the Judge of all the world. The silver and the gold are His, and the cattle on a thousand hills are His. We are His, for He has made us; our very breath is in His hands. No man can say to another, "You are not using your talents aright; therefore, I will take them from you and use them for you." The gift of talents and the reward for their faithful use come from God; and He alone can deprive me of my faithless trust. Vengeance, also, is the Lord's. "Render to no man evil for evil. Take thought for things honorable in the sight of all men. If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, be at peace with all men. Avenge not yourselves, beloved, but give place unto wrath; for it is written, Vengeance belongeth unto me; I will recompense, saith the Lord."[52] Every man, whether millionaire or pauper, intelligent or ignorant, will have to give an account of his own life and his own deeds, and not of those of any one else. If I give one man twice as much per day as I give another man who works for me, I am responsible to no man for it; and need only to be able to render a just account

[52]Rom. xii: 17-19.

to the Judge of all the world. If I see fit to take my money and help one young man through college, rather than another one who would like to go, that is a matter beyond the compulsion of man. If I confine my charities to one town, to one State, one public library or one university, according to my personal pleasure and judgment, it is a trust from above, —not from men.

One man says: "I have nothing. The world owes me a living. What you have is mine." Another man says: "What you have is yours. What I have is mine. You attend to your own business, and I shall attend to mine." A third man follows the principle laid down by the Apostle Paul: "Bear ye one another's burdens; and so fulfil the law of Christ."[53] This text contains few words, but every word is weighty. It is a call, not to idleness, but to service. It is a call, not to selfishness, but to altruism—living for others. This is the law of Christ.

The individual cannot be found who has never felt a need, never borne a sorrow, never shed a tear, never had a regret, and never suffered a pain. Every man you pass on the

[53]Gal. vi: 2.

street, every home, every family, in some form, at some time, has felt, to some extent, at least, the burdens of life. The man with his hundreds of thousands and millions collapses financially, intellectually, spiritually and physically, as easily as the man with his hundreds. Sickness and sorrow, pain and want, destruction and death show no favors. All the world is subject to their sway. The storm at sea, the great city conflagration, the Galveston horror, the Western cyclone, know no class distinction; and all fare alike. The earth is full of sorrow; but it is because it is full of sin. The earth is full of disappointments, blasted lives and blighted hopes because man is human. So it will be unto the end of time. The man who has nothing wants something. The man who has something wants more. Every man, wherever you may find him, is seeking something of this world's treasures. How much sorrow, misery and woe this world has because men are not strong enough to do the right! But how much more trouble, suffering and want there is in the world because men—many men—are not willing to do what is right when they know it! Self-preservation is the first law of nature. The natural man says: "I will take care of

myself. I must take care of myself. I will confine my attentions to my own needs, my own wishes, my own things. I will attend exclusively to my own end of life, just as the attorney-at-law looks out for his client alone, and lets the counsel for the other side take care of it." So it may be that, in the first experience of man with man, we find each one looking solely after his own things and his own gain. Christianity lays down a different law, as St. Paul writes to the Philippians: "Not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others."[54]

We are not left without an example of such a life. The Bearer of the world's burdens was and is Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. Just as there is no life in this world without death, so there is no service without suffering and no burden-bearing without pain. Christ teaches us that the grandest and the noblest thing in life is labor. He who serves is greater than he who is served. Never forget that. That which is and he who is of no service to God or man in this world is a worthless nonentity that receives nothing but condemnation. Christ tells us that the man

[54] Phil. ii: 4.

who is trying to save his life for himself shall lose it; and that the man who is giving his life for others, using it up, is the man who will find life throughout eternity. Christ did as he asks us to do. He bore in His own Person, even to the cross, the sins of sinful man. It was to save you and me, to relieve us, to help us, that He despised the shame, endured the cross, and suffered a shameful death. In the days of His life among men, how He helped, how He sympathized with those bearing heavy burdens! His was always a kind and a tender word. His was always a helpful and merciful act. And, in enjoining us thus to live for others, He assures us that what we do in His name and in His service we do as unto Him Himself.

The world needs sympathy in its struggles, in its sorrows and in its bereavements. The world needs help in its penury and in its want. Christ sends those who would follow Him into the world to lighten its burden, cheer its gloom, allay its pain, sympathize with its afflictions, and help its needs. We seldom think of our own burdens, when we turn our attention to the burdens of others. Our own grow light when we look at the heavy burdens about us. Life, for every man, has its doubts, its diffi-

culties, and its burdens. We are to help each other bear them. The employer is to help the employe. The employe is to help the employer. "All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them,"[55] is the golden rule for all the world. Obey this law, and there will be no strikes and no boycotts. It is not what we get, but what we give; it is not what we have, but what we use; it is not what we know, but what we teach to others; it is not what we profess, but what we practice that tells the story of our life here and our destiny hereafter. We need more love to God. With it, we will have more love for men,—God's other children.

A striking illustration of a conspiracy between men to injure another is found in the book of Acts: "And when it was day, the Jews banded together, and bound themselves under a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul. And they were more than forty which made this conspiracy."[56] This is the same spirit as manifested in the boycott—a conspiracy by any number of persons to injure or

[55]Matt. vii: 12.
[56]Acts xxiii: 12, 13.

destroy another man's business, interfere with his comfort and deny him his equal rights, because he will not join them in their actions. I have never seen or known a godly man—*i. e.*, one who was recognized by his own community as a man who was ever seeking, by constant prayer and study of God's word, to get more of the spirit of Jesus Christ—to have ever taken part in any strike, and most assuredly never in any boycott; for the boycott was born in hell, and thither it leads. It is beneath contempt, for it is detestable and devilish. It is difficult to have any pity for, any compassion on and any respect for any man or woman who engages in, connives at or weakly permits the boycott. I have heard so many people confess they are afraid to say what they think; they are afraid to do what they know and what they admit they ought to do because it will hurt their business; or it will cause unpleasantness with others; some won't like it; or they will be called opprobrious names. What if it does hurt your business? If your business interferes with your good citizenship or with your Christianity, you have no right to be in it. As to some one else not liking it, that is not worth a thought. It should not make one

iota of difference to you what somebody else thinks of you for it. Do you want to be a friend of God and His righteousness, or a friend of the world? You can be sure, if you take a stand for the right, the devil and his minions won't like it, and they will try to make it unpleasant for you. Moreover, you are doing honest labor itself an injustice by permitting strikes and boycotts to continue. It means that much more loss in wages, in respect for law and in character. Be a Christian, and live according to the word of God, though labor agitators boycott the golden rule as being "unfair to organized labor."

The national president of the United Mine Workers of America, writing in *McClure's Magazine* for December, 1902, in referring to the then current six months' strike of that organization, said: "To my mind, the great lesson which the coal strike has taught is that the individual is nothing, the good of society at large is everything." But no man can shift or shun, evade or avoid, his personal responsibility to his neighbor, to his employer, to his country and to his God. "So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God."[57]

[57]Rom. xiv: 12.

The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon his own head, and the wickedness of the wicked upon his own. No man can plead exemption in not having kept his obligation and done his duty by saying that others outvoted him in a union meeting, or that other men induced him to wrong one man to help another. He should not only refuse to do the wrong, but he should go farther and endeavor to keep others from doing the wrong. When little lisping children, clenching their tiny fists, cry out in anger, "Me kill scab!" it is time for the gospel to be introduced into their parents' hearts and homes. St. Paul writes to the Ephesians: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you."[58] "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him."[59] Yet we have the social gospel of class hatred taught to-day in every corner of our land by agitators who proclaim the nefarious doctrine that the la-

[58]Eph. iv: 31, 32.
[59]I John iii: 15.

borer is to look upon the employer as an enemy; that he is to hate work; that he is to hate men of means; that he has been and is being cheated out of his rights; and that the money his employer has has been stolen from the employes. This is the teaching of atheism and anarchy.

Atheists, anarchists and some labor agitators and socialists assert that the church is an enemy to labor and that they are not welcome to its fold. This is not now true and never was. The glorious gospel of Jesus Christ is given to the whole wide world, wherever man is found. "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And he that heareth, let him say, Come. And he that is athirst, let him come; he that will, let him take the water of life freely."[60] "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life."[61] The church wants men,—men of every race and condition. It seeks men, however deep their need. It sympathizes with men in trial and temptation, men in difficulty and doubt. It rebukes sin and crime, on the

[60]Rev. xxii: 17.
[61]John iii: 16.

part of any man or men. Its standard is far above that which the world holds. God cannot look upon sin with any degree of allowance; and His true child will detest, abhor and loathe sin in any and every form. But while Christ and the true Christian alike hate sin, they love the sinner and wish him the best that any man can receive. "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some count slackness; but is longsuffering to you-ward, not wishing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."[62] The churches welcome the poor. They help the poor. They sympathize with the poor. They seek the poor. But all this is true, just the same, of the rich. It is the duty of the church to look after every soul alike. Every man has been created in the image and the likeness of God. That image may be covered with selfishness and sin; it may be almost effaced; but it is there; and the church knows its duty is to reach out the hand of pity and help to save the submerged life. On account of many foreigners who cannot understand our language, on account of indifference to the calls of a higher life, on account of disregard for opportunities at our doors,

[62] II Peter iii: 9.

and on account of the voluntary nature of all our religious instruction, hundreds of thousands of people, perhaps, never go to a church service or a Sunday-school. The bells invite them, the workers invite them, God calls them; but they do not respond. Andrew Jackson, speaking of the Bible, said: "That Book, sir, is the rock upon which our republic rests." Yet we have people to-day objecting to the placing of that rock of republicanism in our public schools,—that Book that instructs at the same time in literature, history, science, morals, good government, and the Christian religion. Our young people, under compulsory school attendance laws, all need and should have instruction in morals, in patriotism and in civic righteousness. This country, for its own preservation, needs to train up its youth in the teachings of Him Who said: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's."[63] Let us remember that the Roman yoke was upon the shoulders of the Jewish people at this time. The Jews tempted Christ, that they might have some charge against Him. Should He tell them to pay tribute to

[63]Matt. xxii: 21.

Cæsar, they would charge Him with being an enemy to His race, an oppressor to the oppressed. Should He tell them not to pay tribute to Cæsar, they would charge Him with treason against the Roman government; and, in either case, stir up stouter opposition against Him and have Him put out of the way. The reformer, the State socialist and communist of our time would have said: "Refuse to pay tribute and tax until you get your rights; organize; oppose the government; force recognition"; but Christ said: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's." The tribute was to be paid. The government was to be respected and obeyed.

"Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil."[64]

"Put them in mind to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient, to be ready unto every good work, to speak evil of

[64]Rom. xiii: 1-3.

no man, not to be contentious, to be gentle, shewing all meekness toward all men."[65]

"Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit to them."[66]

"Be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as sent by him for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well."[67]

Two wrongs do not make a right. For workingmen who are wronged to wrong others does not adjust the difficulty. It complicates and intensifies it. You are to live honestly, not because it is the best policy, which is generally true; but you are to be honest in all your dealings with men, whether you win or lose, whether you become rich or poor, whether employer or employed. Nothing but the gospel of Jesus Christ can and will relieve the present industrial situation of the clash of contending parties. Be men; be law-abiding men; be Christ-like men. It is as easy as it is satanic, to stir up strife by agitation between man and man. "For the churning of milk bringeth

[65]Titus iii: 1-2.
[66]Hebrews xiii: 17.
[67]I Peter ii: 13-14.

forth butter, and the wringing of the nose bringeth forth blood; so the forcing of wrath bringeth forth strife."[68]

The follower of Jesus Christ is to seek peace and contentment, which do not come from any outward possessions, but from within. "So then let us follow after things which make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another."[69] "But godliness with contentment is great gain: for we brought nothing into the world, for neither can we carry anything out; but having food and covering we shall be therewith content."[70]

Jesus Christ laid down a rule that should control between man and man where they are both professed followers of Him, and the one alleges he has been wronged by the other. The general principles will apply, however, to all men. "And if thy brother sin against thee, go, shew him his fault between thee and him alone: if he hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he hear thee not, take with thee one or two more, that at the mouth of two witnesses or three every word may be es-

[68]Proverbs xxx: 33.
[69]Romans xiv: 19.
[70]I Timothy vi: 6-8.

tablished. And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the church: and if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican."[71] Try to reconcile any one who has wronged you and try to get him to see it. If he cannot see it, or will not admit it, there is recourse then to the courts. If the courts adjudge him innocent, you are in the wrong yourself and should gracefully submit. Force is alien, and the strike and the boycott are contrary, both in principle and application, to the laws of our land and the laws of God.

When the multitudes asked Christ what they must do, in view of approaching judgment, he said: "He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath food, let him do likewise. And there came also publicans to be baptized, and they said unto him, 'Master, what must we do?' And he said unto them, 'Extort no more than that which is appointed you.' And soldiers also asked him, saying, 'And we, what must we do?' And he said unto them, 'Do violence to no man, neither

[71]Matt. xviii: 15-17.

exact anything wrongfully; and be content with your wages."[72]

The masses, by the thousands, followed Christ for the loaves and fishes, to be healed of their sicknesses and diseases, to gratify their curiosity and see His miracles, to hear the disputes and arguments of the scribes and Pharisees with Him; but when He laid down the law of His kingdom, that He must suffer and die, and that His disciples must deny themselves and take up their cross and follow Him, great numbers went back and followed Him no more. The masses were not seeking Him in that age, perhaps, as much as they are now. Many of the same voices, doubtless, that cried out, "Hosanna to the Son of David; blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord," on His entry into Jerusalem, again cried out, less than a week later, "Crucify Him, crucify Him!" We have no authentic account of a single witness going on the stand to testify to the innocence of Jesus. Not a voice among the masses who had been helped and healed, not a voice among His chosen followers, who knew Him better than all others, that was raised in His defense. No; the masses never

[72]Luke iii: 10-14.

followed Christ for the sake of a higher spiritual life; and for the same reason they are not crowding the churches to the doors to-day. It is the same gospel now as then. Humanity is the same now as then. Man's need of a higher life is the same now as then. In the last analysis, the conflict is between law and lawlessness; between government and anarchy; between righteousness and sin; between faith in God and atheism.

One of the most prominent anarchists of this country, addressing a meeting of anarchists in Chicago, declared that the first thing they as anarchists had to do was to destroy every altar, to extinguish every religion, to tear God down from the heavens. "What right," he said, "would any man have to govern other men, less God gave him that right. Down with God!" "The first word of religion is a lie," wrote Friedrich Engels. "The idea of God must be destroyed; it is the keystone of a perverted civilization," said Marx.

The anarchist, the assassin, the rioter, the perpetrator and instigator of lawlessness is an atheist, usually, by profession, and always one in fact. God must be driven from His throne before anarchy can seize the crown. The con-

test between atheism and Christianity was thus expressed by the late Joseph Cook, LL. D., in describing an historical incident: "When the Bishop of Paris, in 1871, was brought before Raoul Rigault, one of the boldest of the communists, the venerable ecclesiastic, addressing his accusers, said: 'Children, what do you wish to do with me?' 'We are your betters,' said Rigault, who was hardly thirty years of age. 'Speak as if to your superiors. Who are you?' The Bishop, whose charities had been known in Paris for a generation, replied, 'I am the servant of God.' 'Where does He live?' asked Rigault. 'Everywhere,' was the answer. 'Very well,' said the communist, 'send this Bishop to prison, and issue an order for the arrest of one God, who lives everywhere.' That order was never executed; but until God can be arrested, communism cannot succeed. A few days later, Rigault lay on one of the streets of Paris, half his skull shot away, one eye a clot of blood, and the other, open, was glaring wildly into space, as if he saw the Being Who cannot be arrested."

This is a land of liberty, but it is not a land of license. We hear much of the right of free speech which belongs to every one; but, as a

matter of fact, a man does not have absolutely free speech. He is not permitted to use oaths and profanity; he is not permitted to assault and threaten with the tongue; he is not permitted to use villainous language in speaking to or of others; he is not permitted to perjure himself; he is not permitted to slander other people; but he is, at present, permitted to teach doctrines that aim to destroy the life of our great government and all government. We need a clarion call to manhood, patriotism and civic righteousness. We should have a systematic course of instruction in all our public schools giving the youth of our land instruction in our form of government, the principles of our civic institutions, the duty of abiding by the laws, of loving liberty, of defending the flag, and of hating anarchy and misrule. The Stars and Stripes cannot endure, with the black or the red flag at their side. Respect and obedience must be implanted in the child by the parent in the home, in the scholar by the teacher in the school, in the citizen by the powers of the State, and in the hearts of all by the ambassadors of the Most High. Jesus respected and obeyed the law of the land. He taught others to obey it. He taught respect for jus-

tice, truth and righteousness. He discountenanced and denounced all malice and self-seeking. "This is my commandment, that ye love one another, even as I have loved you."[73]

Nothing will ever be permanently settled until it is settled by God's law of love and righteousness; for Christ Himself said: "Every plant which my heavenly Father planted not, shall be rooted up."[74]

"Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy: but I say unto you, Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. For if ye love them that love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? Do not even the Gentiles the same? Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect."[75]

[73]John xv: 12.
[74]Matt. xv: 13.
[75]Matt. v: 43-48.

"Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth consume, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal; for where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also."[76]

There is something more important than earthly possessions, and that is character and integrity. A man appealed to Christ: "Master, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me." But He said unto him, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" And He said unto them: "Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness: for a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth."[77]

The labor question, in the light of the gospel of Jesus Christ, is not one of economic conditions, but of individual character. Men cannot be legislated good. Society and industry can never be what they might be and what they should be until men themselves, individually,

[76]Matt. vi: 19-21.
[77]Luke xii: 13-15.

become law-abiding and peaceable, under the influence and sway of the Prince of Peace.

"A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."[78]

[78]John xiii: 34-35.

THE PSALM OF LOVE.[79]

"If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal. And if I have the gift of prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing. And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing.

"Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked, taketh not account of evil; rejoiceth not in unrighteousness, but rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.

"Love never faileth; but whether there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether

[79] I Corinthians xiii.

there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away.

"When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child: now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things. For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I have been known.

"But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is LOVE."

DATE DUE

JUN 15 1994

JUN 30 2010

Demco, Inc. 38-293

PMCY 15-07.

HD6495 .U4W27
The law and the gospel of labor,
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00025 1209